

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested. The foregoing amendments are believed to place this application in condition for allowance.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability of 85-89 if rewritten to overcome the Section 112 rejection. In particular, it was noted that the term "said distal tip" lacked antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 85 to overcome this rejection.

Applicants have also amended claims 81, 82, 84, 90, 91 and 93 to depend directly from claim 85, since their prior base claim 80 has been cancelled. The remaining claims of the application have been cancelled without prejudice to presentation in a continuing application and in order to place this application in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The application has been amended to reduce the claims to one independent claim 85 and its dependent claims 81, 82, 84, 86-91 and 93-96. The sole issue raised with respect to claim 85 has been cured by the amendment to provide antecedent basis for the term "distal tip". It is therefore believed that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance and action toward that end is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael D. Beck

Michael D. Beck
Reg. No. 32, 722
Maginot, Moore & Beck
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 638-2922 (phone)
(317) 638-2139 (fax)
mdbeck@maginot.com